

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 16, 1865.

THE COURSE ADOPTED by the Committee of the Stock Exchange in refusing a settling day in the shares of the Russian (Vyksounsky) Ironworks Company (Limited) has been met by that company in a manner which is expected to conciliate all opposition. At a special general meeting of the company, held on Wednesday, the clause in the articles of association, which permitted the directors to increase the capital of the company to the extent of £500,000 was expunged, and another clause substituted, giving the same power to an extraordinary general meeting.

So far as the company is concerned, no doubt they have adopted the wisest course open to them, always supposing the undertaking to be valuable as represented, and the Committee of the Stock Exchange may now be gracious. After having repudiated all bargains the members of the Stock Exchange may now set to work and make fresh ones, for it is not probable that their new decree, if favourable to the applicants, will have the effect of reviving all bargains made previously to the first refusal, and, indeed, if it would of itself have that effect, it is more than probable that the opposition would be as strong as before, and that a settling would be again refused.

We are, therefore, justified in presuming that the "bears," having attained their end—namely, the voiding of their contracts, will withdraw their opposition. What a picture, then, this action of the Stock Exchange presents of the commercial morality of the great city of London. Any investor can go to the Stock Exchange and purchase shares for the settling-day from a man who practically retains in his hands the power to repudiate the bargain, if, before the settling-day is fixed, the price of the shares shall, contrary to expectation, suffer an extraordinary rise or fall. This inestimable benefit conferred on intending investors loses nothing by the fact that the Stock Exchange has a practical monopoly in the purchase and sale of shares, and, therefore, the public are altogether in their hands.

What direction legislation on this subject will take it is impossible to foresee, but now that public interest has been aroused, the rules of the Stock Exchange must be altered, or its prestige for honest dealing will be gone. We would not go so far as to suggest that the refusal of the committee to appoint a settling-day should not, of itself, operate to nullify all bargains previously made in cases where fraud is proved, in fact, we think it ought to have that effect, but we do think that in a case where so great a power is vested in an unofficial body, they should be compelled, in every case of refusal, to state their reasons, and, if necessary, be protected in so doing. If, however, a settling-day were refused on the ground that some one or other of the rules of "the house" had not been complied with, then unless fraud has arisen by reason of such non-compliance, we cannot see why all bargains should be void, but we apprehend it would be sufficient that their completion should be suspended until the question could be settled by a competent court of law or equity, and, if necessary, at the expense of "the house." Unless the Stock Exchange will submit its dealings to the operation of a law of such or a similar description as here proposed, it is evident the public will not much longer consent that their investments, entered into *bona fide*, shall be arbitrarily upheld or rescinded, as heretofore, by an irresponsible body.

MR. BADELEY does not stand alone among the lawyers in advocating the inviolability of the seal of confession. An opinion in its favour is said to have been given also by Mr. J. D. Coleridge, Q.C. He thinks that by law a clergyman may plead privilege, and refuse to reveal secrets confided to him under the seal of confession, except in cases of high treason, on the ground that Coke lays down that the privilege of confession must be respected, and that the Church of England tolerates confession in its formularies, which are enforced by statute. The bearing of these formularies on the question was considered in the notice of Mr. Badeley's letter; * but as regards Coke, who was likewise relied on by Mr. Badeley, we did not enter upon a discussion of the argument in his letter, based on Coke's reading on the *Articuli Cleri*, stat. 1, 9 Ed. 2, as we then confined our attention to the text of the statute. We may now say a few words on the alleged authority of Coke in favour of the privilege of confessors to refuse to disclose confessions when sworn as witnesses in courts of justice. In order that the true character of Coke's authority may be understood, it is necessary to make rather lengthy extracts. The 10th chapter of the statute relates, as Mr. Badeley rightly says, to violation of the privilege of sanctuary, and provides, by way of answer, as follows:—

"They that abjure the realm, so long as they be in the common way, shall be in the King's peace, nor ought to be disturbed of any man; and when they be in the church their keepers ought not to abide in the churchyard, except necessity or peril of escape do require so. And so long as they be in the church they shall not be compelled to flee away, but they shall have necessities for their living. . . . And the King's pleasure is, that thieves or appellors (whenever they will) may confess their offences unto priests; but let the confessors beware that they do not erroneously inform such appellors."

On this, Coke's Commentary is—"This branch extendeth only to thieves and approvers indicted of felony, but extendeth not to high treasons; for if high treason be discovered to the confessor, he ought to discover it, for the danger that thereupon dependeth to the King and the whole realm; therefore this branch declareth the common law, that the privilege of confession extendeth only to felonies. . . . So as this branch beginneth with thieves, extendeth only to approvers of thievery or felony, and not to appeals of treason; for by the common law, a man indicted for high treason could not have the benefit of clergy (as it was holden in the King's time, when this Act was made), nor any clergyman privilege of confession to conceal high treason; and so was it resolved in 7 Hen. 5, whereupon frier John Randolph, the Queen Dowager's confessor, accused her of treason, for compassing the death of the King; and so was it resolved in the case of Henry Garnet, superior of the Jesuits in England, who would have shadowed his treason under the privilege of confession; . . . and albeit this Act extendeth to felonies only, as hath been said, yet the *careat* given to the confessors is observable, *ne erronee informant*."

From this passage it is plain that, according to Coke, there was a privilege of confession; the question is whether the privilege meant by him either supports Mr. Coleridge's opinion, which we have mentioned, or justifies Mr. Badeley's interpretation, that Coke may fairly be understood to have intended that the statute, by establishing the right of thieves and approvers to go to their confessors, established also their right to the seal of confession as a right annexed to confession by the common law. What, in short, did Coke mean by this privilege of confession? We think his language shows that he only intended that clergymen were not bound to inform against these criminals confessing to them. For Coke, arguing, says if high treason be discovered to the confessor, he ought to "discover" it; again, that a clergyman

* *Ante*, p. 926.

has not privilege of confession to "conceal" high treason for that John Randolph, the Queen Dowager's confessor, "accused" her of treason. The *caveat* is *ne erronee hujus modi appellatores informant*. An appeller was the same as an approver, or person who "turns queen's evidence." Whatever the *caveat* may mean, the act respecting which the confessor is warned is one of "information." This is the view taken in "Taylor on Evidence" of a clergyman's privilege of confession. There is, it need scarcely be said, a wide difference between informing against a person and giving evidence against him on a summons or *subpoena*. We do not, therefore, admit that Coke is an authority for the seal of confession in the sense in which that term is used by Mr. Badeley and Mr. Coleridge.

Mr. Coleridge himself is not confident in his opinion, for at the close he admits that the point is not clear, and passes from the common to the divine law, and to ethics, in recommending each clergyman to settle the question for himself on the grounds of religion and personal honour.

THE PROCEEDINGS against Mr. Frederick Thomas Hall for forgery, which were referred to on a previous occasion,* have been brought to a termination, and we are now enabled to lay before our readers a short account of them. There were two cases—the one was a charge of having uttered, disposed of, and put off, knowing the same to be forged, a copy of a writ of *capias*, and this case was heard before Mr. Knox at Marlborough-street; the other was a charge, instituted by Madame Valentin, of uttering and putting off a certain document in writing, intended to be used in evidence in a certain court of record, to wit, the Central Criminal Court, knowing the same to have been fraudulently altered; also with receiving the said document, knowing the same to have been stolen. This latter case referred to a portion of an account book which belonged to Madame Valentin, and which was to be used for the purpose of proving a charge of perjury against the present prosecutrix, and the case was heard before Sir Robert Carden on the 11th instant. In the former case there seems to have been no doubt that a sham writ was made out, but it was contended for the defence that no offence had been committed within the meaning of the Consolidated Forgeries Act, 24 & 25 Vict., c. 98, s. 28, and that it would not be a forgery unless the document was put in force against the person whose name appeared in the instrument. Mr. Knox appears to have entertained this view, and as he considered there was some doubt as to the construction of the statute, we will not here attempt a solution of the difficulty. This summons for forgery was therefore dismissed.

In the second case there really seems to have been no evidence brought to prove the forgery which was alleged to consist in certain alterations made in the figures, and also in additions made to the accounts in question, and the prosecution totally failed in sustaining the charge.

It is very much to be hoped this is the last we shall hear of Madame Valentin, for so many proceedings have been taken by one or other of the parties concerned and their solicitors, that one becomes utterly bewildered in vain efforts to remember the position at which matters have arrived.

To Mr. Hall it must be a great satisfaction that he is cleared from these very grave charges, and that it has been publicly announced that his character is as free from taint as before the proceedings were commenced.

A MEETING WAS HELD on Monday week last of ladies and gentlemen interested in the prevention of infanticide, for the purpose of considering what steps could be adopted to arrest its progress. Dr. W. H. Clarke, the recorder of Rangoon, gave the ladies and gentlemen pre-

sent the benefit of his experience in India. His first impression was that revolving boxes should be established as in France for the reception of infants; but after fully considering the matter in all its bearings he had been compelled very reluctantly to abandon his faith in that scheme, inasmuch as it would lead to an increase of immorality and involve an expense which no society would be able to maintain. What he had in view mainly was the welfare of the children, although he could not exclude from view the welfare of the mothers, or the punishment of the wicked fathers. As the law at present stood they had a compulsory registration of births, and if a woman concealed the birth of a child she was liable to severe punishment. He would suggest that there should be a registration of pregnancy, and that every woman should be bound to register herself three or four months before the anticipated birth. It would be a bold step to take, but it would prove an effectual means towards getting at the fathers of illegitimate children, and rendering them liable for their support. In the next place, he would alter the law of affiliation; for it was a disgraceful thing that a man who had sinned in this way should only be liable to the payment of half-a-crown a-week. Further, he would suggest that there should be in London a hospital, to be open day and night, for young women whose peril was near upon them. The Rev. J. W. Buckley, M.A., incumbent of St. Mary's, Paddington, thought that it would be unadvisable to adopt any course that would run counter to the prejudices of the public, and he was of opinion that a proposition for registering pregnancy would be a very startling thing indeed. The meeting was ultimately adjourned to the 4th of October, without having adopted any resolution.

In Dr. Clarke's idea of "revolving boxes," he seems to have had in view their establishment by means of private charity; but it is obvious that any such scheme, if adopted, must be at the expense of the State; but we have already, in this Journal, stated our opinion that such a step would be unadvisable on the part of the Government of this country, and unsuccessful as regards the end in view.

As to the monstrous proposition that every woman should register her pregnancy, although Dr. Clarke had the audacity—we had almost said the indecency—to propose it before a mixed audience of ladies and gentlemen, no House of Commons could, we apprehend, be found to discuss and pass a law enacting such a registration. Neither do we think such a law could be enforced; for, apart from the natural aversion women have to make public what is in ordinary life kept secret, and, as far as possible, unmentioned, it would be difficult to convince the more influential part of the public that for the small amount of good which could be done we should be justified in wantonly shocking the modesty of the many in our vain attempts to discover the delinquencies of the few. Moreover, a very small part of the child-murders are such as would be discovered by these means. It is not a difficult matter for a woman to have a child born dead, and the only means of discovering the facts of any particular case would be the interrogation of the accused; we should scarcely go so far as to assume guilt in the absence of proof of innocence. Again, we are at a loss to see how registration of pregnancy would be an effectual means towards getting at the fathers of illegitimate children; for all purposes of proof five months is as far off as nine, and what other proof could we have that the law as it is does not provide? We quite agree with Dr. Clarke that the law of affiliation might be altered with advantage, but we would by no means agree blindly to adopt his view on this point, which, after all, bears rather distantly on the subject of infanticide. These good people, who are, with beneficent intentions, trying to do good to their fellow-creatures, and to suppress the existence of a crying evil, must consider whether their proposal will not tend to increase immorality. That some very decided

measure should be adopted is obvious, for the law, as at present administered, does not effect its object, but it may, in all seriousness, be asked whether the law is not strong enough to punish this offence if only two conditions are complied with—the one that the offence itself be brought to light and its perpetrator discovered; the other, that the law be carried out in every instance without fail. The former condition we confess to be a difficulty, but the latter only requires that judges and juries should be thoroughly convinced of the magnitude of the existing evil.

THE CASE OF THE UNITED STATES *v.* PRIOLEAU, recently decided by Vice-Chancellor Wood, and noticed in these columns, has raised the expectations of the holders of bonds of the late Confederate States of America. The idea seems to be, that if any property of the late Confederate States can be found in this country or in France, a lien may be established over it in favour of the bondholders. In order to understand the position of the holders of these bonds, it is necessary to be informed that the loan was based on the condition that the bondholders might at any time have cotton in exchange for their bonds, but they must go to Charleston, or Wilmington, or some other port to fetch it, and run all the risk of the blockade established outside. If, however, the holders did not adopt this means of paying themselves, they would get their interest, and be paid off at par in course of time by means of periodical drawings. This being the case, the only property on which a lien could by any possibility attach in respect of this loan would be the cotton which was, to a certain extent, hypothecated for the purposes before mentioned, but which could scarcely be said to be actually and expressly so hypothecated unless claimed before the intervention of the *vis major* in the shape of the United States Government. This cotton being in the seaport towns and cities of the South, and now in the possession or power of the North, the remedy, if any, of the English bondholders would be in the courts of the United States. The case of *The United States v. Prioleau* was one in which a specific article had been assigned to persons in this country for the payment of a specific debt owing to them, and the question was whether the lien still attached, although the property in the remainder of the article pledged became vested in a different person. If it is pretended that any property has been sent to this country to be sold for the purposes of paying either the principal or interest of the Confederate cotton loan, it will be a fair question to raise whether a lien attaches, so as to give the bondholders a right to recover the value of such property from the holders of it. As it was never the intention to send cotton to this country for the purposes of the loan, unless it might be for the payment of the interest, or of the bonds drawn to be paid off at par, there is no probability that any property is available for such a lien. Probably a small sum of money has been sent, and is in the hands of the agents, for payment of the interest due, but it seems doubtful whether even that can be recovered if the agents choose to retain it. The Confederate Government has now ceased to exist, and the United States, which would naturally, as in *Prioleau's case*, seek to prevent any funds they could lay claim to from being diverted from their own coffers, would not in this case assist the bondholders, by instituting legal process to enforce payment. We are inclined to the opinion that one of the bondholders at the meeting recently held was correct, when he suggested they should look for payment to the Confederate States and not to the Federal Government. The Confederate States might (though we think it improbable) subscribe to pay off the bondholders who had risked their money to establish a struggling race, but that the United States can be expected to do so is a contingency we had rather not discuss. That not a cent can be recovered from them we have no shadow of doubt.

PREFERENCE SHARES.

The legal career of the Scarborough Cliff Hotel Company appears to be one of unvarying calamity. The hotel will have many claims upon the patronage of the lawyers if it progresses in the highly intellectual course the directors have marked out for it. What a delightful recreation it will be for a junior, who has made his fortune in assisting to dispel the contentions of the members, to spend a part of his vacations, after he has graduated in silk, in a place, every nook and crevice of which will remind him of interlocutory and perpetual injunctions. The hotel will thus combine the *utile dulci* for both branches of the profession, and the good living of the place will, instead of displacing, stimulate to future victories the jural metaphysics of its guests.

The company was a limited one for the special object of improving the health of its patrons and the finances of its members by the establishment of a hotel. The articles of association provided that the shareholders should receive a dividend in rateable proportion to the number of their shares. The directors had no power to issue preference shares, but they had power to alter the articles of association and to borrow money.

The company, being short of funds, held two extraordinary general meetings, at which they resolved to raise the requisite funds by the issue of preference shares. The plaintiff, however, took prompt steps for an injunction to restrain the directors from issuing such shares; and Vice-Chancellor Kindersley granted the application, considering such shares to involve a breach of contract with the original shareholders, who had implicitly contracted with each other to stand on an equal footing *inter se*. This ruling was on appeal confirmed by the Lord Chancellor, with costs; when his Lordship stated that he considered the intended issue of shares so militated against a fair construction of section 72 of the articles of association, under which the directors were empowered, with the sanction of the company in general meeting, to declare "a dividend to be paid to the shareholders in proportion to their shares," that such an "inequality" could not be effected, even by the roundabout process of a special resolution under section 50 of the Act of 1862, altering the articles of association so as to give the directors power to issue preference shares. The Lord Chancellor, in short, considered that the issue of preference shares was in all cases a matter *ultra vires*, except where the memorandum of association provided for their issue. It was not necessary for his Lordship to have then decided whether section 50 of the Act of 1862 did not permit of such an issue by means of a special resolution passed as directed in section 51. But his Lordship's ruling was that, as the matter came before him, the directors had no power to issue preference shares.

The directors gladly took the hint of altering the articles, although the Lord Chancellor did not, by any means, intimate an opinion that such a circuitous route would bring them nearer their desired El Dorado of preference shares. The directors, however, convened a general meeting, and had a special resolution passed altering section 72 of their articles, and empowering them to issue preference shares. The redoubtable Hutton, however, once more brought up the delinquents before the same Vice-Chancellor, from whom he had already obtained some redress, and his Honour decided that the alteration of section 72 of their articles, for the purpose of issuing preference shares, was itself *ultra vires*, and a breach of contract with the original shareholders.

The 18th clause in the articles of association, after referring to the power given in the 17th to increase the capital, provided that "the increased capital shall be raised from time to time on the number of shares, and of their amount and value, and, subject to these articles, on such conditions as the extraordinary general meeting shall direct." This clause, however, although so general in its terms, was construed by the Vice-Chancellor and Lord Chancellor on the two former occasions to be mere

general words *ejusdem generis* as the context, and to confer a power merely of altering details, not of disturbing the original basis of the company, by which all the members were placed on an equal footing. The Vice-Chancellor now ruled *pari ratione*, that the power to modify articles of association given by section 50 of the Act of 1862 extends only to details of administration and management, and not to the fundamental basis of the constitution of the company. The soundness of his Honour's view cannot be questioned; and it is a source of much satisfaction to find a course of decisions on the point so harmonious as to impart a degree of philosophic precision to this branch of companies law. The centrifugal forces which tend to draw away directors from their proper functions appear to be vastly greater than their prudence and capacity of administration. Few escape yielding to the temptation of amalgamating with another company, or borrowing in excess of their powers, of applying the funds of the company to purposes never contemplated by the original shareholders and memorandum of association, of issuing preference shares, and, in short, of doing matters so wholly *ultra vires* as to be unattainable even by the roundabout scheme resorted to by the Scarborough Cliff Hotel Company, of altering the articles of association, even though there be such power expressly given them by the articles. The thunders of the Vice-Chancellors appear insufficient to restrain them, or to enforce the maxim *ne auctor ultra crepidam*. On the contrary, the joint-stock Proteus laughs at the suggestions of the Court, and after being warned against tampering with section 50 of the Companies Act, nevertheless drives the company's chaise boldly through the centre of the very section, and leaves the *onus* of undoing the Act on the Court of Chancery. The shareholders, we fear, will scarcely appreciate this wager of battle with the Vice-Chancellors on their own ground. Indeed, it was decided by Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, two years ago, in *Moss v. Syers*, 11 W. R. 1046, that a power to increase capital by the creation of new shares, or to alter the articles of association, did not authorize the issue of preference shares either directly, or after an alteration of the articles permitting such an issue.

Directors require to be carefully watched. There is seldom any necessity to excite them to diligence; their constitution is plethoric; their temperament sanguine; and they appear to enjoy in their body corporate all the united energies of the shareholders concentrated as in a focus. Who has yet discovered a director to neglect a lucrative investment. On the contrary, what pitfall with only a plausible surface has been avoided by them? The tendencies and errors of directors are all on the side of excess; and any decision impairing their power to drag the company after them whithersoever they please, is to be highly commended for its policy. It is now settled beyond the possibility of doubt, that any direct attempt by directors to alter the mutual equality of shareholders is *ultra vires* and void. But of what avail is the plucking away a single thorn out of so many, since the directors can indirectly accomplish the same object; nor do we see the utility of preventing them from issuing preference shares of their own accord, and the preferring one class of shareholders to another, when they can prefer not merely one class of shareholders to another, but a total stranger to the entire body of shareholders. Suppose, for instance, that from the extravagance of directors, or any other cause, the company suffers from a want of cash, if the directors, indeed, attempt to acquire a supply by the issue of preference shares the effort will, according to the most recent decisions, be *ultra vires* and void; but if they simply borrow what they require, even in excess of their power, the securities issued for such loan will, not always be impeachable, even though the directors should be held personally responsible to the shareholders for having exceeded their borrowing powers (*vide Cornick v. Parry*, 21 Sm. & G. 143, 7 Ex. 255; *Hill v. Manchester and Salford Waterworks Company*, 2 B. & Ad. 544). The *Times*, in a leader of the 26th ult.,

on the dispute between Captain Jervis and the directors of the Great Eastern Railway Company, with respect to their having borrowed in excess of their power, pronounces the securities issued in excess to be "worthless." If they are, we can only say that all the debentures of the company are "worthless," which is not the fact. The argument, therefore, proves too much, and is logically "worthless." How could the *Times* distinguish the excessive debentures from those issued within the limit of the borrowing powers? If they were ear-marked, or of a different nature from the legalized securities, so that the lender, or his transferee, would have notice of the fraud (for such it is), of the directors on the company, the matter would be different. But if any of these conditions is wanting, one debenture is as good as another. In vain, then, do prudent Vice-Chancellors declare against the validity of preference shares until some mode is discovered of preventing directors from injuring shareholders to the same extent indirectly, by contracting loans in excess of their borrowing powers by means of securities of the description authorized by their Act.

JUDICIAL STATISTICS, 1864.

PART I.

The perusal of a blue book is not a task which men, whose time is occupied, consider desirable, neither do they always care to discover for themselves the results shown by a large mass of tabulated information; we therefore take up our annual task of laying before our readers such of the chief features of the judicial business of the country last year as are of importance and as may be thought acceptable.

There is an increase in the number of police and constabulary of 227, the total number, including 236 "additional constables appointed for special purposes," being 22,849. With regard to this item of additional constables it is remarked that in many of the boroughs a practice prevails of employing occasionally in police duties men who at other times follow their different occupations, and these men have hitherto been included in the borough returns. Excluding, then, men of this description to the number of 97, it appears that the actual increase in the police force of the whole of England and Wales is only 130. In the Metropolitan police force there is an increase of 92, and in the city of London of 21. On the other hand it appears that this increase is more than in proportion to the increase of population; for, whereas, in 1863, the police were in the proportion of 1 to 937, they were in 1864, in the proportion of 1 to 906 of the estimated population.

The cost of this force appears to increase largely, and the increase was in 1862, £17,771; 1863, £61,271; 1864, £41,947; the total cost for 1864 being £1,700,212 19s.

The average cost per man has also increased from £130 16s., in 1859, to £135 1s. 5d. in 1864. Out of the above large sum of £1,700,212 19s. the revenue contributes £108,804, being an increase on the previous year of £9,722. Of the Metropolitan police the total cost was £527,248 3s. 8d. While we look at the proportion which the whole of the constabulary force bears to the estimated population of the country, it is also well to observe the proportion it bears to the number of the criminal classes at large. The known thieves are 23,298; receivers, 3,188; prostitutes, 28,094; suspected persons, 30,237; and vagrants, 31,932; making a total of 116,749. Thus it appears that for every 46 of the criminal classes there are 9 constables, or about 5 to 1. In the year 1863 the number of the criminal classes at large was 126,139, while the average for the years 1858, 1859, and 1860, was 133,902 showing on the whole a very material decrease. In analysing these numbers we find that the total decrease from the year 1863 is divided as follows:—

The metropolis, 847, or 6·4 per cent.; pleasure towns, 0; agricultural district towns, 171; commercial ports, 41; manufacturing towns, 0; cotton, 0; textile, 153, or 8·0 per cent.; hardware, 391, or 7·8 per cent.

The proportion borne by these classes to the population is highest in the pleasure towns, and lowest in the metropolis; but taking the number of prostitutes separately, the proportion is highest at the commercial ports, and lowest at the seats of hardware manufactures.

In addition to those at large, we must reckon the criminals in local prisons and reformatories 20,532, and those in the convict prisons 7,975, making in all a grand total of 145,256, being a decrease of 10,129 on the number of the previous year.

Whether this decrease is attributable to the increased number and efficiency of the police force we are not prepared to assert, but at the same time the police must have some portion of the credit.

Crimes were committed in the year 1864 to the number of 51,058 and 28,734 persons were apprehended; in both numbers there is a decrease, but they show that a very large proportion, nearly one-half of the crimes committed in this country are not traced so far as to cause the arrest of the suspected persons, and of the number of those arrested only about two-thirds are committed for trial by the magistrates. They are disposed of as follows, namely—

Discharged, 8,700; discharged on bail to appear if required, 142; bailed to appear for trial, 1,590; committed for want of sureties, 46; committed for trial, 18,226.

The number and nature of the indictable offences committed in 1864, so far as known, was as follows:—

Murders, 134, being an increase of 13 in the number of the preceding year. There were 46 attempts to murder. The cases of shooting at, stabbing, wounding, &c., with intent to do bodily harm, were 773. Those of manslaughter were 214, being 27 less than the preceding year. Those of concealment of birth were 235, against 219 in 1863, and following an increase of 62 in that year as compared with 1862. There were 232 cases of rape, and 366 assaults with intent to ravish and abuse; 769 cases of assault, 701 robberies and attempts to rob on the highway, and 2,591 cases of burglary and house-breaking. There were 1623 cases of breaking into shops and warehouses, and attempts to commit this offence. The larcenies of all descriptions reported as indictable and not summarily proceeded against were 34,829. The cases of arson were 543. There were 44 indictable offences against the game laws not summarily disposed of, 207 of horse-stealing, and 68 of cattle-stealing. In all those instances where no increase or decrease is specified, the alteration from the previous year's return is not very material either way. In the metropolitan police districts 14 cases of murder were reported, in the city, none; and only 1 attempt to murder, and four cases of manslaughter. Out of the total number of 28,734 persons apprehended on these charges, about 14,862 were convicted, being rather more than one-half.

Greater vigilance is evidently required if only 14,862 convictions take place in respect of 51,058 crimes committed during the year, and it does not speak much for the efficiency of the police that so large a proportion of crime goes unpunished.

Besides the convictions before mentioned, there were, in the year 1864, 300,731 persons summarily convicted by the magistrates out of 440,913 who were proceeded against, leaving a balance of 140,182 who were discharged. The number convicted is more by 17,090 than the number in 1863. The proportion of persons convicted was, as compared with the number proceeded against, in 1864, 68·2 per cent.; in 1863, 67·2 per cent.; in 1862, 66·7 per cent.; in 1861, 66·7 per cent.; in 1860, 66·4 per cent.; in 1859, 65·6 per cent.; thus showing a clear gradually increasing average. Among the punishments inflicted we find 443 were whipped. Among the offences we find an increase in the numbers under almost every head. In assaults it amounts to 7,651, having been 7,349 in 1863. In offences against the game laws the increase is 479.

The returns sent in by the coroners for all the different jurisdictions distinguish in the cases of infants of seven years of age and under, those of legitimate from those of

illegitimate birth. Verdicts of murder in the cases of infants of one year old and under, show a total of 203 as against 166 in 1863, an increase which must have been looked for considering the increasing prevalence of the crime of infanticide, and which will, no doubt, be largely added to in the first half-year of 1865. In the total number of inquests there is an increase, as compared with 1863, amounting to 2,030. Verdicts of murder and suicide each show a small decrease being 24 in the former and 48 in the latter, the totals being 246 and 1,339. The percentage of inquests held upon infants of seven years old or under was 27·9 and of that number 18·5 per cent. were illegitimate; 7·5 per cent. of all the inquests were upon children between the ages of 7 and 16 years.

(To be continued.)

COURTS.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

Sept. 12.—*Bail in Criminal Cases.*—In the case of *The Queen v. Schmidt*, Mr. Sleigh renewed an application previously reported to admit the prisoner to bail. He had been committed to Lewes Gaol by the Brighton magistrates, for receiving stolen property. His wife was also committed at Petworth for receiving stolen property belonging to the Brighton Railway. Mr. Brooks, from the office of Messrs. Palmer, produced the depositions, and offered no opposition on the part of the magistrates. Mr. Baron Bramwell said bail in criminal cases was a serious matter, and required much consideration. Mr. Sleigh remarked that such applications were frequently made. Some justices in the country had strange notions as to bail. After much discussion his lordship reluctantly agreed to take two bail in £100 each. Inspector Carpenter, attached to the Brighton Railway, produced to Mr. Baron Bramwell a list of articles found at the defendants' house, and his lordship declared that he would not bail the defendant, and refused the application. In another case, *The Queen v. Hughes*, Mr. Lewis (Lewis & Lewis) opposed an application for bail, and Mr. Beard supported. The prisoner was committed by the Lord Mayor on a charge of robbing his employer. Mr. Baron Bramwell refused the application, saying that the sessions of the Central Criminal Court would be held on Monday.

The days of attendance at Judges' Chambers during the remainder of the vacation will be on Tuesday and Friday. The business at the Judges' Chambers is diminishing, and when a judge is not in attendance it bears about it an appearance of the "long vacation." At the end of the year all fees under a new Act of Parliament will be collected by stamps at the chambers. Three times in each week, on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, until further notice, a vacation-master will attend the Exchequer to transact public business.

MANSION HOUSE.

Sept. 13.—*Important to solicitors' clerks.*—In consequence of some alleged malpractices in this court by persons not legally qualified as solicitors, the Lord Mayor has deemed it necessary to lay down a stringent rule for the future, that in addition to barristers, none but certificated attorneys and articled clerks to attorneys shall be allowed to conduct a prosecution or a defence at the Justice-room. It was much wanted; for, besides the inconvenience in other respects of the practice which has been superseded, it often furnished a pretext to some members of the legal profession, after receiving fees, to entrust to clerks not under articles the duties which they themselves should have performed. Prisoners, especially, had much reason to complain of the practice. Yesterday a case occurred under the new rule. A person appeared to defend a prisoner, and when asked if he was a solicitor, or an articled clerk to one, replied in the negative, though he said he had been in the profession for about thirty years, but had not this year taken out his certificate.

Mr. Oke, the Chief Clerk, told him that there had been so many irregularities by unprofessional persons appearing in cases, that the Lord Mayor had been obliged to make a rule excluding them for the future.

The LORD MAYOR.—And I shall act upon it too. The other day I declined to hear a person who claimed to represent Mr. Beard, on the ground that he was not a solicitor.

Upon that, the applicant yesterday withdrew, and the case proceeded without his services.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

PIG-STYS.

Sir,—I reside in a rural parish, the chief portion of the population of which is composed of agricultural labourers. My residence is too close to be pleasant to a row of cottages inhabited by farmer's men; nearly each of whom indulges in the luxury of keeping a pig. The odours which at times arise from the stys of these "common and unclean" things are intolerable; and, as I intend to take the necessary steps to abate what I conceive to be a nuisance, I shall be glad if one of your legal readers will inform me whether I am right in supposing that the law forbids the keeping of a pig in a sty within forty yards of any dwelling house.

BUCOLICUS.

APPOINTMENTS.

WILLIAM HENRY DOYLE, Esq., has been appointed Chief Justice of the Bahama Islands.

JOSEPH HENRY WATLEY, Esq., has been appointed one of her Majesty's counsel for the Island of Nevis.

MR. CHARLES PALMER PHILLIPS has been appointed by the Lord Chief Justice revising barrister for the city of London in the room of Mr. Hanson, who has succeeded Mr. Trevors at the Stamp Office.

IRELAND.

COURT OF ADMIRALTY.

Henry Connaughton, Esq., LL.D., of the Connaught bar, introduced by the Queen's Advocate and Dr. Battersby, has been called to be an advocate of the High Court of Admiralty in Ireland.

CONSOLIDATED CHAMBER.

(Before Mr. Justice O'Hagan).

Sept. 12.—*Devereux v. Morrissey*.—This was an action to recover the sum of £4,000 on foot of a bill of exchange.

Mr. Sidney, Q.C., for the defendant, applied for liberty to appear and defend the action, or that the summons and plaint be set aside on the ground that the bills sued on became due within six months prior to action brought, and that there was no averment that the plaintiff had any right to sue upon them, the statement being that the defendant made the bills in February and March, 1862, and endorsed them to a third party. Another objection was that the bills were drawn at sixty days' sight, and that the plaintiff did not aver when he "sighted" them. Counsel submitted that if the summons and plaint were not set aside he had plain ground for a demurrer.

Mr. Dowse, Q.C., and Mr. J. B. Murphy opposed the application.

Mr. Justice O'Hagan said that, seeing the question raised was of very serious importance, he would let it stand for the full Court.

REVISING BARRISTERS.—The revision of the lists of voters will commence this month, and will be concluded by the end of October. By a recent Act (28th Vict. c. 36) some alterations have been made. No court is to be held by a revising barrister for the revision of the lists of a county before the 20th of September in any year. The following new regulation will take effect in the next revision:—"Section 16. It shall be lawful for any revising barrister, whether revising the lists of a county, city, or borough, to order any person to be removed from his court who shall interrupt the business of the court, or refuse to obey his lawful orders in respect of the same; and it shall be the duty of the chief constable, commissioner, or chief officer of police of the county, city, borough, or place in which the court is held, to take care that an officer of police do attend that court during its sittings for the purpose of keeping order therein, and to carry into effect any order of the revising barrister as aforesaid."

INCOME TAX DEPARTMENT.—It appears from a Parliamentary return that in the year ended 5th April last there were 8,981 cases in which persons having incomes between £100 and £200 received back a portion of the income tax, as abatement provided by law. The amount so refunded was £15,500 1s. 8d.

REMOVAL OF ONE OF THE CITY LAW COURTS.—The learned Secondary Judge of the Secondaries Court in the City of London has received notice to quit from the landlords of his offices. The Secondaries Court, which was formerly in Coleman-street, has been ever since 1830 located in Basinghall-street, and in the back room on the ground floor the learned Secondary has for thirty-five years heard cases at times involving, upon writs of inquiry, very large sums of money. The house belongs to the Mercers' Company, who are now effecting great alterations in the street, and who will shortly pull down four or five houses in order that extensive offices may be erected on the sites. Amongst the number of those who have received notice is the learned Secondary, who will remove to 20 and 21, Basinghall-street, on or before September 29. It may be here mentioned that as a city law court the Secondary's office was always looked upon as a kind of curiosity, the court-room itself having formerly been a wool warehouse.

A WELCOME REFORM.—A correspondent writes to the *Pall Mall Gazette* as follows:—"I yesterday attended at the office of one of our leading solicitors to sign a marriage settlement to which I had been appointed trustee. I have officiated in a similar capacity on many previous occasions, on all of which I have had to take the contents of the parchment I signed on trust, in consequence of my inability to read the peculiar characters in which they were engrossed, and to follow with the eye close lines of strange writing three feet in length, without any stops, broken here and there by a word in still more illegible German text. It always seemed to me to be the object of solicitors so to write leases, wills, and settlements that nobody but themselves could read them without enormous trouble and waste of time. I was therefore prepared yesterday to sign as usual without reading, but to my very great surprise, Mr. —, instead of laboriously unfolding a huge harsh sheepskin, illegibly wrought over with undecipherable hieroglyphics, put into my hand a vellum pamphlet about the size of the *Saturday Review*, each leaf of which was numbered and neatly margined with red ink. On its leaves was written in a round clear hand, as easily eligible as print, the marriage settlement I came to sign. I was thus enabled to make myself master of its contents in a very few minutes; had it been drawn up in the old style of legal hieroglyphic, I should certainly not have adventured upon the labour of deciphering it at all. It is to be hoped that this clerical reform will even become general, and that in future people will thus have an opportunity of reading, if they please, all legal documents before they sign them."

MR. WINDHAM'S COSTS.—The costs of the proceedings in lunacy against Mr. Windham have at length been ascertained and paid, and it seems that, so far from getting anything by them, their authors have had to pay £13,000, which has been contributed by Gen. Windham, the Marquis of Bristol, Lord Listowel, and one or two others.—*Correspondent of Belfast News-Letter*.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

Sept. 11.—By Messrs. KING & SON.

Freehold dwelling-house, outbuildings, and 20a 1r 39p garden ground, near Turnham-green, Acton; let at £113 4s. 2d. per annum—Sold for £5,300.

Leasehold dwelling-house and farm buildings, known as Little Ealing Farm, Ealing, with about 41 acres of meadow land; let at £105 per annum; held for 21 years from 26th October, 1849; at £3 14s. 6d. per year—Sold for £865.

Freehold and leasehold, Greenford Farm, Greenford, Middlesex, comprising dwelling-house, agricultural buildings, and 188a 1r 39p meadow land; let at £250 per annum—Sold for £4,350.

Leasehold dwelling-house, Paul's Bakehouse-court, Goddard-st., Doctor's commons; let at £125 per annum—Sold for £1,170.

Sept. 12.—By Messrs. STARKY & PHIPPS.

The one-fifth part or share of freehold and copyhold estate, situate at Thwaite and Mundham, Norfolk, and a similar share of the tithes of the parish of Gayson, near Lynn, the whole producing nearly £150 per annum—Sold for £2,200.

AT THE GUILDHALL HOTEL.

Sept. 12.—By Mr. G. HAINES.

Leasehold residence, 65, Ebury-street, and stable in Ebury Mews, Fimlico; estimated value, £130 per annum; term, 58 years from Lady-day last; ground-rent, £12 per annum—Sold for £1,360.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

ROGERS.—On Sept. 8, at Cromer, Norfolk, the wife of Benjamin Bickley Rogers, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.

DAY.—On Sept. 12, at Elderfield, Kidderminster, the wife of Arthur James Day, Esq., Solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

ALDRITT—FRANKLIN—On July 31, at St. George's Cathedral, Madras, Cosmo M. Aldritt, Esq., Solicitor, to Emily Maria, eldest daughter of J. J. Franklin, Esq., Superintendent of Marine, Madras.
ALLAN—OLDAKER—On Sept. 7, at St. Margaret's, Barking, Essex, William David Allan, of Harp-lane, city, and Lower Edmonton, eldest son of the late William Allan, Esq., Solicitor, Edinburgh, to Agnes, youngest daughter of W. A. Oldaker, Esq., of Gaysham Villa, Ilford.
BINTLEY—SMITH—On Sept. 7, at the Parish Church, Otley, Yorkshire, Joseph Bintley, Esq., Architect, of Kendal, Carlisle, and Blackburn, to Anne Lena, eldest daughter of the late William Smith, Esq., Solicitor, Otley.
COOKE—GREATORREX—On Sept. 12, at Trinity Church, Westbourne-terrace, William Henry Cooke, Esq., Q.C., to Annie, Second daughter of J. Greatorrex, Esq., of Cleveland-square.
HAWKSFORD—JACKSON—On Sept. 12, at St. John's Catholic Chapel, Bridgnorth, James Edward Hawkford, of Richmond, Surrey, and Lincoln's-inn, London, Solicitor, to Alice Eugenia, only daughter of Thomas Augustine Jackson, Esq., of Eardington, near Bridgnorth, Salop.
MAYO—PERRIN—On Sept. 7, at the Parish Church, Cameley, Somerset, Charles Thomas Mayo, Esq., Solicitor, Corsham, Wilts, to Mary Hayward, eldest daughter of Joseph Perrin, Esq., Temple Cloud.
ROGERS—SKIDMORE—On Sept. 7, at Wakefield, William Rogers, of London, Solicitor, to Sarah, youngest daughter of J. A. Skidmore, of Wakefield, Esq.

DEATHS.

HUTCHINSON—On Sept. 12, at Harewood-hill, Darlington, Henry Hutchinson, Esq., Solicitor, aged 55.
PRICE—On Sept. 12, at Stourbridge, Emily, the wife of Rowland Price, Esq., Solicitor, aged 49.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, Sept. 8, 1865.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Cae Seys Hematite Iron Ore Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated July 26, appointed Frederick Whinney, 5, Serle-st., Lincoln's-inn, official liquidator.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Sept. 12, 1865.

Hearts of Oak, Bell Inn, Whitebrooks, Monmouth. Sept. 5.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, Sept. 8, 1865.

Brown, Richd Thornton, Adame-st, Old Broad-st, London, Oil Broker. Dec 24. Nicholson, Lime-st.
Croome, John, Berkeley, Gloucester, Tanner. Nov 13. Vizard & Co, Dursley.
Evans, Wm, Cefn Mawr, Ruabon, Denbigh, Draper. Nov 1. Richards, Llangollen.
Hallam, Edwd Strutt, Brunswick-pl, Southampton. Oct 7. Perkins, Southampton.
Harvey, Rev Wm Woodis, Alverton, nr Torquay, Devon, Clerk. Oct 1. Sanders & Burch, Exeter.
Henson, Harriott, East View, Sheffield, York, Spinster. Nov 1. Brown & Son, Sheffield.
Nicholson, Wm, Walton-on-the-Hill, Lancaster, Sharebroker. Oct 10. Norris & Son, Lancaster.
Searle, Jas, Wellington-rd, Stoke Newington, Gent. Oct 6. Nash & Co, Suffolk-lane, Cannon-st.
Sebright, Sir Thos Gage Saunders, Beechwood, Herts, Baronet. Sept 29. Tylee & Co, Essex-st, Strand.
Thurman, Wm, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Oct 31. Watson & Wadsworth, Nottingham.
Tripp, Rev Chas, Silverton, Devon, D.D. Nov 30. Rowellife, Stogumber, nr Taunton.
Woodhead, Sarah, Sheffield, Innkeeper. Nov 7. Fretson.
Woodhead, Wm, Sheffield, Innkeeper. Nov 7. Fretson.

TUESDAY, Sept. 12, 1865.

Barnett, Lazarus Conway, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Oct 1. Burton & Browne, Nottingham.
Blake, Chas, Ford Farm, Laversock, Wilts, Esq. Oct 9. Snow, College-hill.
Bower, John, Wollaton, Nottingham, Gent. Oct 24. Burton & Browne, Nottingham.
Davidson, Jessy, Mount Radford, Exeter, Devon, Widow. Oct 16. Prickman, Exeter.
Harrison, Robt, Eastwood, Nottingham, Gent. Oct 31. Burton & Browne, Nottingham.
Jarman, Edwd, Baily, Llangirrig, Montgomery, Farmer. Nov 1. Woosnam, Newtown.
Laver, Robt Wm, Hookley, Essex, Farmer. Sept 29. Crik, Maldon, Essex.
Martin, Geo, Southampton, Wine Merchant. Oct 9. Green & Moberly, Southampton.
Owen, Joseph, Sheffield, York, Comm Agent. Nov 30. Turnley, Cannon-st.
Shaw, Susanna, Wardle, Lancaster. Oct 9. Holmes, Burnley.
Shawcross, Wm, Gorton, Lancaster. Oct 24. Shawcross, Stockport.
Walkington, Wm Robt, Stock Exchange, London. Oct 31. Garrard & James, Suffolk-st, Pall Mall.
Wilson, Wm, Radford, Nottingham, Victualler. Oct 24. Burton & Browne, Nottingham.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, Sept. 8, 1865.

Atkinson, Rich, North Burton, York, Grocer. Aug 25. Asst. Reg Sept 8.

Avery, Wm, Chelwood, Somerset, Merchant. Aug 12. Inspectorship. Reg Sept 8.
Barratt, Wm, & Jas Wilson, Manch, Calico Printers. Aug 22. Comp. Reg Sept 6.
Bellaers, Jas, Limehouse, M.D. Aug 8. Conv. Reg Sept 5.
Bolshaw, John, Salford, Butcher. Aug 22. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Cardozo, Geo Hy, New Broad-st, Secretary to a Mining Co. Aug 31. Comp. Reg Sept 6.
Cred, Geo, Preston-next-Faversham, Kent, Builder. Aug 28. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
De Vries, Jules, Gt Tower-st, Gent. Sept 6. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Dunkley, Alfred, Bristol, Comm Agent. Sept 4. Conv. Reg Sept 8.
Dunn, Penniston, Datchet, Bucks, Agent. Aug 22. Arrt. Reg Sept 8.
English, Wm Woolgar, Shoreham, Sussex, Coal Merchant. Aug 31. Comp. Reg Sept 6.
Franks, Emil, Gresham-st, Merchant. Aug 15. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Goodale, Herbert, Chick, Derby, Draper. Aug 14. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
Grear, Derric, Leeds, Draper. Aug 28. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
Hollier, Osmond, Fareham, Southampton, Grocer. Aug 26. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
Hope, John, jun, Chester, Chemist and Druggist. Aug 30. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Humphry, Eli, Beamister, Dorset, Grocer. Sept 1. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
Jay, Joseph Price, Hackney, Middx, Upholsterer. Aug 14. Asst. Reg Sept 7.
King, John, Putney, Surrey, Saddler. Aug 11. Conv. Reg Sept 7.
Nason, Thos, jun, Windsor, Berks, Fishmonger. Sept 6. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Noble, Geo, Russell-pl, Fitzroy-sq, Architect's Clerk. Aug 28. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Pewtress, Joseph Wilmshurst, Gracechurch-st, Paper Manufacturer. Aug 23. Comp. Reg Sept 6.
Portington, Roger, Holloway, Middx. Sept 7. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Rees, Daniel Morgan, Pembroke Dock, Watchmaker. Sept 5. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Revell, Joseph, Dukinfield, Chester, Master Plasterer. Aug 10. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Ridgway, Thos Moss, & Thos Shaw, Foulkes, Hanley, Stafford, Grocers. Aug 22. Asst. Reg Sept 8.
Robertson, Geo, Birm, Currier. Aug 11. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Simester, John Edwin, Caledonian-rd, Licensed Victualler. Sept 7. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Stevenson, Wm, Manch, Tailor. Aug 18. Comp. Reg Sept 5.
Stevenson, Thos, Whitehall, nr Walsall, Stafford, Coal Master. Aug 11. Inspectorship. Reg Sept 5.
Strudwick, Chas, Ealing, Middlesex, Builder. Aug 8. Comp. Reg Sept 5.
Sumersford, Thos, Oxford, Paper Dealer. Aug 25. Comp. Reg Sept 7.
Thurrott, Edwd, Colchester, Essex, Jeweller. Aug 9. Conv. Reg Sept 6.
Walker, Cecil, Lower Norwood, Gent. Sept 2. Asst. Reg Sept 6.
Woodhouse, Lionel Leighton, and Hy Walker Kerridge, Abchurch-yd, General Merchants. Aug 9. Inspectorship. Reg Sept 6.

TUESDAY, Sept. 12, 1865.

Adams, Walter, sen, Birm, Gun Manufacturer. Aug 15. Asst. Reg Sept 11.
Adamson, Edwd, Sunderland, Durham, Draper. Sept 5. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Alexander, Geo, Manch, Comm Agent. Sept 6. Comp. Reg Sept 12.
Bebb, Hy Chas Lewis, Cambridge-ter, Notting-hill, Solicitor. Sept 9. Comp. Reg Sept 12.
Burd, Eli, Portland-ter, Notting-hill, Grocer. Aug 14. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Butcher, John, Blackpool, Lancaster, Draper. Aug 22. Conv. Reg Sept 11.
Collinson, John, South Cave, York, Draper. Sept 6. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Cooke, Edwd, Manch, Engraver. Sept 1. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Cunliffe, Whitaker, Rawtenstall, Lancaster, Greengrocer. Aug 17. Conv. Reg Sept 11.
Davies, Jas, Sketty, nr Swansea, Glamorgan. Aug 30. Comp. Reg Sept 9.
Edmondson, Christopher, Huddersfield, Draper's Assistant. Aug 15. Conv. Reg Sept 11.
Gardner, Jas, Maidenhead, Berks, Builder. Sept 11. Comp. Reg Sept 12.
Gough, Geo, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Butcher. Aug 17. Asst. Reg Sept 9.
Hancock, Wm, Southampton, Bookseller. Aug 11. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Jewett, Mark, Marlboro'-villas, Richmond, Surrey, Comm Agent. Sept 8. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Jones, Benj, Birkenhead, Chester, Land Agent. Aug 17. Asst. Reg Sept 9.
Lees, Wm, Oldham, Lancaster, Joiner. Aug 12. Comp. Reg Sept 9.
Maidl, Jas, Charlotte-mews Fitzroy-sq, Middx, Cabinet Manufacturer. Aug 25. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Murgatroyd, Jas, Halifax, York, Draper. Aug 15. Conv. Reg Sept 11.
Newman, Jas, Melksham, Wilts, Butcher. Aug 15. Asst. Reg Sept 9.
Oliff, Wm, Chatham, Kent, Painter. Aug 9. Comp. Reg Sept 5.
Reynolds, Jacob, Lpool, Gent. Aug 18. Release. Reg Sept 12.
Robinson, Joseph, London-rd, Southwark, Paper Hanging Dealer. Aug 18. Conv. Reg Sept 11.
Sleet, John Warwick, Kingston-upon-Hull, Boot Maker. Aug 22. Comp. Reg Sept 8.
Spencer, Jas, Kingston-upon-Hull, Manure Manufacturer. Sept 4. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Springbett, Joseph, Clement's-lane, Lombard-st, Architect. Aug 14. Comp. Reg Sept 11.
Spurr, Jas Fredk, Scarborough, York, Attorney. Aug 30. Asst. Reg Sept 8.
Stacey, Edwin, Landport, Hants, Jeweller. Aug 16. Conv. Reg Sept 12.
Stevens, Peter, Presteign, Radnor, Farmer. Aug 14. Asst. Reg Sept 9.
Valter, Eugene, Birm, Hardware Dealer. Aug 16. Conv. Reg Sept 9.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Sept. 8, 1865.

To Surrender in London.

Archer, Maria, Widow, & Hy Tristram Archer, St James-st, Piccadilly Tailors. Pet Sept 1. Sept 26 at 11. Lawrence, Old Jewry-chambers.
 Baker, John, Poultry, Comm Agent. Pet Aug 29. Sept 19 at 1. Howell, Cheapside.
 Benit, John Adrian, Savage-gardens, Provision Comm Agent. Pet Sept 5. Sept 20 at 12. Hoare, Middle Temple.
 Cooper, Thos, Chapel-st, Pentonville, out of business. Pet Sept 2. Sept 19 at 12. Eldred & Andrew, James-st, Bedford row.
 Dickson, Jas, Clare-market, Gold Beater. Pet Sept 6. Sept 20 at 1. Morris Strand.
 Drage, Alfred, Fenny Stratford, Buckingham, Grocer. Pet Sept 6. Sept 20 at 1. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
 Everett, Geo, Kosauhter Victoria-pk, Comm Agent. Pet Sept 4. Sept 20 at 11. Bramwell, Basinghall-st.
 Giles, Wm, Fair-st, Horselydown, Basket Maker. Pet Sept 4. Sept 20 at 11. Edwards, Bush-lane.
 Gorrings, Fredk John, & Geo Richd Godfree, Belvedere, Kent, Builders Pet Sept 5. Sept 20 at 12. Steadman, Coleman-st.
 Guppy, John Wm, Leicester-rg, Middx, Bootmaker. Pet Sept 1. Sept 20 at 11. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.
 Hatter, John Jas, Gracechurch-st, London, out of business. Pet Sept 5. Sept 20 at 12. Brandon, Strand.
 Moore, Isaac, St John's road, Hoxton, Middx, Tailor. Pet Sept 4. Sept 20 at 11. Bramwell, Basinghall-st.
 North, Hy, sen, Central-st, St Luke's, Middx, Coal Dealer. Pet Sept 5. Sept 19 at 1. Munday, Strand.
 Papineau, Rossall Wm, Bromley, Middx, Gent. Pet Sept 2. Sept 19 at 1. Bell & Co, Bow Church-yard.
 Frowse, Wm, Kensington, Middx, Stonemason. Pet Sept 6. Sept 20 at 1. Jay, Marylebone.
 Roberts, Hy, Luton, Bedford, Boot Maker. Pet Sept 6. Sept 20 at 1. Linklaters & Co, Walbrook.
 Rosenberg, Meyer, Sandy's-row, Bishopsgate, Cap Manufacturer. Pet Sept 5. Sept 20 at 12. Lewis & Lewis, Ely-pl.
 Stevens, Philip Hordle, Moorgate-st, London, Merchant. Pet Aug 25. Sept 19 at 1. Lawrence & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.
 Tallis, Fredk, Hemingford-rd, Islington, out of business. Pet Sept 5. Sept 20 at 12. Fow, Fleet-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Burrows, David, Foleshill, Warwick, Baker. Pet Aug 31. Coventry, Sept 26 at 3. Smallbone, Coventry.
 Croome, John, King's Norton, Worcester, Bricklayer. Pet Sept 5. Birm, Sept 18 at 10. Sargent, Birm.
 Evans, Robt, Gwyder, Carnarvon, Miner. Pet Sept 5. Llanrwst, Sept 19 at 4. Jones, Conway.
 Gregory, Enos, Shipley, Derby, Contractor. Pet Sept 7. Birm, Sept 26 at 11. Sugg, Hekeston, Derby.
 Henshall, Joseph, Scholes Wigan, Lancaster, Innkeeper. Pet Sept 6. Manch, Sept 29 at 11. Ward, Manch.
 Hickin, Ebenezer Hunter, Wolverhampton, Greengrocer. Pet Sept 4. Wolverhampton, Oct 10 at 12. Langman, Wolverhampton.
 Holcroft, Catherine, and Wm Holcroft, Upholland, Lancaster, Shopkeepers. Pet Aug 29. Wigan, Oct 5 at 9. Heald.
 Hudson John, Kimberley, Nottingham, Lace Maker. Pet Aug 29. Birm, Sept 19 at 11. Maples, Nottingham.
 Hyde, Thos, Andenshaw, Lancaster, Carpenter. Pet Sept 5. Ashton-under-Lyne, Sept 28 at 12. Tvo, Ashton-under-Lyne.
 Johnson, John, Norwich, Labourer. Pet Sept 5. Norwich, Sept 22 at 11. Chittock, Norwich.
 Latham, Chas, Snaith, York, Brewer. Pet Aug 28. Goole, Sept 16 at 11.30. Bantock, Selby.
 Mason, Hy, Birm, Journeyman Baker. Pet Sept 6. Birm, Oct 9 at 10. East, Birm.
 Mathews, Jas, Aston-juxta-Birm, Builder's Foreman. Pet Sept 4. Birm, Sept 18 at 10. Duke, Birm.
 Minty, Ambrose, Bathaston, Somerset. Pet Aug 31. Bath, Sept 18 at 11. Collins, Bath.
 Morrod, Thos, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Picture Frame Manufacturer. Pet Sept 4. Newcastle, Sept 23 at 10. Joel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 Morse, Wm, Newnham, Gloucester, Saddler. Pet Sept 4. Newnham, Sept 20 at 10. Gould, Newnham.
 Oliver, Stephen, Ellington, Northumberland, Journeyman Stone Mason. Pet Sept 5. Morpeth, Sept 23 at 11. Wilkinson, Morpeth.
 Pearson, Jabez, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Aug 16. Blackburn, Sept 25 at 1. Wheeler & Co, Darwen.
 Robinson, Chas Coyne, Navenby, Lincoln, Joiner. Pet Sept 5. Birm, Sept 19 at 11. Rex, Lincoln.
 Shauman, Jas, Lpool, Baker. Pet Sept 1. Lpool, Sept 26 at 3. Anderson, Lpool.
 Shelton, Hugh, Melton-rd, Syston, Leicester, Butcher. Pet Sept 2. Leicester, Sept 23 at 10. Petty, Leicester.
 Sidwell, Aaron, Castleford, York, Licensed Victualler. Pet Sept 2. Pontefract, Sept 22 at 11. Jefferson, Pontefract.
 Southall, Saml, Litchurch, Derby, Millman. Pet Sept 6. Derby, Sept 31 at 12. Briggs, Derby.
 Sparr, Jas, North Duffield, York, Wheelwright. Pet Sept 4. Selby, Sept 23 at 11. Barlow, Selby.
 Townend, Geo, Kendall, Westmoreland, Tanner. Pet Sept 4. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Sept 19 at 12. Hoyle & Shipley, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 Williams, Humphrey, Tynencen, Flint, Farmer. Pet Sept 6. Lpool, Sept 22 at 12. Dodge, Lpool.

TUESDAY, Sept. 12, 1865.

To Surrender in London.

Adams, Chas, Bromley, Kent, Builder. Pet Sept 8. Sept 26 at 1. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.
 Barltrop, Joseph, Essex-rd, Islington, Boot Maker. Pet Sept 6. Sept 26 at 11. Goldrick, Strand.
 Basington, Jas, John-st, Shoreditch, Middx, Ironfounder. Pet Sept 8. Sept 27 at 11. Wood & King, Basinghall-st.

Blackier, Antonio, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Sept 7 (for pau). Sept 26 at 12. Edwards, Bush-lane, Cannon-st.
 Brampton, Thos Saml, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Sept 8 (for pau). Sept 27 at 12. Drew, Basinghall-st.
 Clarke, Wm Masters, Grafton-st, Soho, Heraldic Embosser. Adj Sept 8. Sept 27 at 11. Brook, New-inn, Strand.
 Jackson, Chas, Haversstock-hill, Middx, Book Keeper. Pet Sept 8. Sept 27 at 12. Goldrick, Strand.
 Oliver, Edwd, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Sept 8 (for pau). Sept 27 at 11. Goatley, Bow-st, Covent-garden.
 Osborne, Jas, James-st, Clapham, Tailor. Pet Sept 8. Sept 27 at 11. Bramwell, Basinghall-st.
 Peck, John, Praed-st, Paddington, Haberdasher. Pet Sept 6. Sept 26 at 11. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.
 Reeks, Edwin Hy, Wimborne Minster, Dorset, Painter. Pet Sept 8. Sept 26 at 1. Peacock, South sq, Gray's-inn.
 Saunders, Jas, Chilworth, Surrey, Farmer. Pet Sept 6. Sept 26 at 12. Wild & Barber, Ironmonger-lane.
 Schuster, John Emanuel, Galway-st, St Luke's, Shirt Dresser. Pet Sept 7. Sept 26 at 12. Flippes, Coleman-st.
 Snowball, Geo, Spring-st, Paddington, Watchmaker. Pet Sept 9. Sept 27 at 12. Cooper, St Martin's-lane.
 Sumner, Jas, Chapel-st, St George's-in-the-East, Oil and Colourman. Pet Sept 9. Sept 27 at 12. Hogan, Martin's-lane, Cannon-st.
 Whale, John Edwd, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Sept 9 (for pau). Sept 27 at 1. Goatley, Bow-st.
 Wilmore, Jas Thos, Pontenille-rd, Racket and Ball-Maker. Pet Sept 6. Sept 26 at 11. Marshall, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

To Surrender in the Country.

Atkinson, Thos, Little Sutton, Chester, Gardener. Pet Sept 7. Birkenhead, Sept 23 at 11. Ritson, Lpool.
 Atkinson, Thos, Lincoln, Butcher. Pet Sept 7. Lincoln, Sept 23 at 11. Chambers, Lincoln.
 Barnitt, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Adj July 18. Salford, Sept 23 at 9.30.
 Bateson, John, Sheffield, Tailor. Pet Sept 8. Leeds, Sept 29 at 12. Fernel, Sheffield.
 Brock, Saml, Kirkheaton, York, Journeyman Mason. Pet Aug 25. Huddersfield, Sept 28 at 10. Freeman, Huddersfield.
 Cooke, Wm Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Pet Sept 2 (for pau). Lancaster, Sept 29 at 12. Gardner, Manch.
 Dealy, Thos, Lpool, Poultry Dealer. Pet Sept 4. Lpool, Sept 28 at 3. Thornley, Lpool.
 Evans, Robt, Denbigh, Shoemaker. Pet Sept 6. Denbigh, Sept 20 at 12. Davies, Holywell.
 Gallie, John Adolphus, Newport, Monmouth, Potatoe Merchant. Pet Sept 8. Bristol, Sept 22 at 11. Blake, Newport, and Press & Ink-skip, Bristol.
 Hare, Geo, Swanshead, Lincoln, Grocer. Pet Sept 6. Boston, Sept 27 at 10. Bales, Boston.
 Howard, Geo, Burton Mill, Kirkbraton, York, Corn Miller. Pet Oct 5. Huddersfield, Sept 28 at 10. Sykes, Huddersfield.
 Larkin, Lewis, Maidstone, Kent, Paper Maker. Pet Aug 31. Maidstone, Sept 16 at 11. Goodwin, Maidstone.
 Mangnall, John, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Pet Sept 2 (for pau). Lancaster, Sept 29 at 12. Gardner, Manch.
 Medhurst, Chas Fredk, Llanilly Bresson, Iron Manufacturer. Pet Sept 6. Bristol, Sept 22 at 11. Fussell & Pritchard, Bristol.
 Molineaux, Jas, Wolverhampton, Licensed Victualler. Pet Sept 7. Birm, Oct 6 at 12. Allen, Birm.
 Noble, Christopher, Huddersfield, York, Waste Dealer. Pet Aug 22. Huddersfield, Sept 28 at 10. Taylor, Huddersfield.
 Nutter, John, Sevenoaks, Kent, Builder. Pet Sept 6. Sevenoaks, Sept 23 at 12. Camell, Sevenoaks.
 Owen, Fredk John, Sheffield, out of business. Pet Sept 5. Leeds, Oct 13 at 12. Micklethwaite, Sheffield.
 Parton, Saml, Birm, Grocer. Pet Sept 1. Birm, Oct 6 at 12. Southall & Nelson, Birm.
 Poole, Joseph, Acton Trussell, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. Pet Aug 31. Birm, Sept 29 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
 Rhodes, Jas, Leeds, Hackle Manufacturer. Pet Sept 7. Leeds, Sept 25 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
 Roberts, Robt, New Brighton, Chester, Dealer in Slates. Pet Sept 11. Lpool, Sept 22 at 11. Price, Lpool.
 Saunders, Jas, Sussex, Carpenter. Pet Sept 8. Brighton, Sept 27 at 11. Mills, Brighton.
 Sellers, Alex, Manch, Hosier. Pet Sept 8. Manch, Sept 25 at 12. Storer, Manch.
 Shaw, Edwd, Huddersfield, Plumber. Pet Sept 5. Huddersfield, Sept 28 at 10. Craven, Huddersfield.
 Skinner, Greenham, Digby, Lincoln, Cordwainer. Pet Sept 9. Sleaford, Sept 23 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.
 Street, Hy, Farnham, Hants, Blacksmith. Pet Sept 2. Portsmouth, Sept 29 at 11. White, Portsea.
 Walker, Geo, Cheetham, Manch, Assistant Newsagent. Pet Sept 7. Manch, Sept 26 at 11. Andrew, Manch.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals possessing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal to Sterling Silver.

	Fiddle Pattern.		Thread.		King's.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Table Forks, per doz.....	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 3 0	2 3 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 2 0
Table Spoons	1 10 0	and 1 18 0	2 8 0	3 0 0	3 0 0
Dessert ditto	1 0 0	and 1 10 0	1 15 0	2 2 0	2 2 0
Tea spoons	0 12 0	and 0 18 0	1 3 6	1 10 0	1 10 0

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon forwarded on receipt of 20 stamps.

TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES, will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Somerset House. Established nearly 30 years. Orders above £2 sent carriage free.